



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,891	05/19/2006	Masaki Hamada	290075US40PCT	3477
22850 7590 09/02/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER KHOSHNOODI, NADIA	
			ART UNIT 2437	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/02/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/579,891	Applicant(s) HAMADA, MASAKI	
	Examiner NADIA KHOSHNOODI	Art Unit 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-14 are cancelled. Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to pending claims 15-28 filed 6/24/2010 have been fully considered but are moot in view of new grounds rejection. The Examiner would like to point out that this action is made final (See MPEP 706.07a).

Information Disclosure Statement

Although the information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/22/2009 was filed after the mailing date of the non-final office action on 4/1/2009 was in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, Examiner would like to note that Applicants also filed an NPL document entitled "Decision of a Patent Grant" that was not cited in the IDS and thus not considered. If Applicants would like for that NPL document to be considered, Applicants are asked to include it in an IDS.

Examiner requests that Applicants either submit the corresponding IDS for this NPL document or make a statement if Applicants believe that it is not necessary for the NPL document to be listed in an IDS to be considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

I. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2437

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

II. Claims 15-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Talpade et al., US Pub. No. 2004/0148520, and further in view of Sharp et al., US Pub. No. 2003/0110394 and Sonnenberg, US Patent No. 7,076,650.

As per claims 15, 21, and 25:

Talpade et al. substantially teach a system/method/computer readable recording medium for protecting a communication device against a denial-of-service attack, comprising: a monitoring device provided on a local area network including the communication device, the monitoring device being configured to monitor a packet transmitted to the communication device via an internet-service-provider network (par. 17, lines 1-19 and par. 20); and a restricting device provided on the internet-service-provider network, the restricting device being configured to restrict a packet to the local area network (par. 17, lines 23-37), wherein the monitoring device includes an attack detecting unit configured to detect an attack by the packet on the communication device (par. 17, lines 1-12), and a protection-request-information transmitting unit configured to transmit protection request information indicating a request for protection against the attack (par. 17, lines 10-19 and par. 22); and the restricting device includes a packet restricting unit configured to restrict a packet transmitted to the communication device via the internet-service-provider network based on the protection request information (par. 17, lines 23-37 and par. 24). Furthermore, Talpade et al. teach that all traffic determined to be non-DDOS traffic is routed back onto the ISP network (par. 33).

Not explicitly disclosed is the protection-request-information transmitting unit being configured to update the protection request information to remove packets if not included in the

Art Unit: 2437

attack from restriction based on a report of received packets transmitted from the restricting device. However, Sharp et al. teach packets may be held if a threshold is reached so that the network bandwidth is not negatively effected, where once the threshold has been lowered a determination is made as to whether IP addresses on the choke list are still active (par. 47-48 and par. 50). Sharp et al. further teach that packets from inactive IP addresses are not a part of the attack anymore so the IP address on the choke list is removed from the list so those packets may pass (par. 52). Finally, Sharp et al. mention that once the thresholds have been reduced, packets that are decided based on probability to be 'good' packets may be allowed into the system (par. 85-87). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Talpade et al. to remove the restrictions from packets that were determined to no longer be a part of the attack and to allow the 'good' packets into the system. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Sharp et al. suggest that constantly updating the choke list by removing the restrictions prevents attackers from continuing to change IP addresses if 'dead' IP addresses are not removed frequently and that determining based on probability which packets were good packets allows for those packets to be sent into the system in par. 52 and par. 85-87.

Also not explicitly disclosed is wherein the protection request information includes a certificate authenticating the monitoring device. However, Sonnenberg teaches that a firewall and other nodes which assist with packet scanning perform mutual authentication using certificates in order to establish trust amongst these monitoring devices (col. 8, lines 55-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2437

to modify the method disclosed in Talpade et al. to include support for certificates which may be used in authenticating monitoring devices. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Sonnenberg suggests that it's important to establish a level of trust between the monitoring node and other nodes and that this trust may be established through an authentication procedure employing certificates in col. 8, lines 55-63.

As per claims 16, 22, and 26:

Talpade et al., Sharp et al., and Sonnenberg substantially teach the system/method/computer readable recording medium according to claims 15, 21, and 25. Furthermore, Talpade et al. teach wherein the monitoring device further includes a signature generating unit configured to generate a signature indicating a feature of a packet that attacks the communication device, the protection-request-information transmitting unit transmits the protection request information including the signature to the restricting device, and the packet restricting unit restricts a packet corresponding to the signature (par. 26).

As per claims 17, 23, and 27:

Talpade et al., Sharp et al., and Sonnenberg substantially teach the system/method/computer readable recording medium according to claims 16, 22, and 26. Furthermore, Talpade et al. teach wherein the restricting device further includes a signature determining unit configured to determine whether the protection request information including the signature is appropriate, and the packet restricting unit restricts a packet corresponding to a signature that is determined to be appropriate, and does not restrict a packet corresponding to a signature that is determined to be inappropriate (par. 20). Not explicitly disclosed is where the

Art Unit: 2437

signature is based on the certificate. However, Sonnenberg teaches the use of certificates in an authentication procedure, where it is extremely well known for certificates to incorporate features (such as a public key) to enable the use of determining if a signature is authentic (col. 10, lines 29-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Talpade et al. to determine if the protection request which contains a signature is appropriate based on the certificate. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Sonnenberg suggests that it's important to establish a level of trust between the monitoring node and other nodes and that this trust may be established through an authentication procedure employing certificates in col. 8, lines 55-63.

As per claims 18, 24, and 28:

Talpade et al., Sharp et al., and Sonnenberg substantially teach the system/method/computer readable recording medium according to claims 16, 22, and 26. Furthermore, Talpade et al. teach wherein the restricting device further includes a report generating unit configured to generate a report including a feature and an amount of packets corresponding to the signature, and a report transmitting unit configured to transmit the report to the monitoring device (par. 20 and par. 22), the signature generating unit generates a new signature based on the report, the protection-request-information transmitting unit transmits the protection request information including the new signature to the restricting device (par. 26), and the packet restricting unit restricts a packet corresponding to the new signature (par. 26 and par.

Art Unit: 2437

34).

As per claim 19:

Talpade et al., Sharp et al., and Sonnenberg substantially teach the system according to claim 18. Furthermore, Talpade et al. teach wherein the restricting device further includes a forwarding unit configured to forward the protection request information to other restricting devices provided on the internet-service-provider network (par. 27), the forwarding unit being configured to determine whether to forward the protection request information based on the report generated by the report generating unit.

As per claim 20:

Talpade et al., Sharp et al., and Sonnenberg substantially teach the system according to claim 17. Furthermore, Talpade et al. teach wherein the restricting device further includes a determination-result transmitting unit configured to transmit a determination result of the signature determining unit to the monitoring device, the signature generating unit of the monitoring device generating a new signature indicating the feature of the packet that attacks the communication device when the determination result indicates that the signature is inappropriate (par. 34).

**References Cited, Not Used*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. US Pub. No. 2004/0250124
2. US Patent No. 6301668
3. US Pub. No. 2002/0087885
4. US Pub. No. 2003/0135762
5. US Pub. No. 2003/0145226
6. US Patent No. 6,609,205
7. US Pub. No. 2004/0054925
8. US Pub. No. 2004/0128550
9. US Pub. No. 2004/0172557
10. US Pub. No. 2004/0199793

The above references have been cited because they are relevant due to the manner in which the invention has been claimed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2437

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadia Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3825.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/Nadia Khoshnoodi/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437
8/27/2010

NK

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437